

“Statement Analysis of Melissa Gusé’s Facebook Live Video from October 13, 2018”, *Finding Truth In The Lie* on YouTube, 2019.05.26, a transcript by ./SYNOPTEX, 2023.07.03~2025.06.19-09:56.

Original publication: [youtube.com](#)

Archived version: [archive.org](#)



Statement Analysis of

Melissa Gusé’s Facebook Live Video from October 13, 2018

CONTENTS

Description.....	2
Transcript.....	2
Introductory context.....	2
Key notes on Statement Analysis.....	2
Pronouns, articles, objective time.....	3
High sensitivity indicators.....	4
Other principles and indicators.....	4
Analysis.....	6
Sentence 1.....	6
Sentence 2.....	7
Sentence 3.....	8
Sentence 4.....	8
Sentence 5.....	8

Description

- The first 10 minutes of this video goes over some Statement Analysis basics that will be helpful in understanding the analysis
- The analysis of Melissa's October 13, 2018, Facebook Live Video starts immediately following
- It is recommended that the Statement Analysis videos are viewed in order
- More to come...

Transcript

Introductory context

00.00 Karlie Lain Gusé is a now 17-year-old girl from Chalfont, California, who went missing the morning of October 13, 2018, under mysterious and, some might say, suspicious circumstances. In an effort to report to the public that her stepdaughter, Karlie, was missing, Melissa Gusé sent out many Facebook live videos, the first of which was 10 hours after Karlie reportedly went missing.

What was Melissa Gusé's primary message in her Facebook Live videos?

What was Melissa asking for?

What happened on that morning in October?

Those are some of the questions I sought answers to after listening to Melissa's message in late 2018. There was a sense that not only her intended message was awkwardly worded, but her general behavior was odd. Melissa's video starts with her dramatically gulping water in a set in a bathroom. That did catch my attention. This caught the attention of many people, including national media. Was this a stepmother in distress asking for help to find her stepdaughter? Her own words led me to the answer.

Key notes on Statement Analysis

What is Statement Analysis? Statement Analysis is 01.00 an accurate way of determining whether a person is lying in a verbal or written statement. A person cannot give a lengthy statement without revealing information they did not intend to reveal. People's words will betray them. If someone is lying, their brain knows what really happened. The brain must now choose words while attempting to deceive.

Analyst Kaaryn Gough has the best description of how statement analysis works. Kaaryn describes words as marbles. Picture each word being a marble, all stored in a cabinet. Some are red, some are blue. The subject must choose which marbles to take out of the cabinet. Since reality is stitched together as one, when a person is deceptive, he or she must keep track of the lies told because of the interconnection of words to reality. If the person wishes to lie about point C, then points A and B must be kept in line and point D

^{02.00} must also follow. It is simply easier to tell the truth, which is why direct lying causes internal stress. As the person opens the cabinet door to choose a blue marble, a red one falls out and then she reaches up with her hand to stop the marbles from falling out, which is difficult. This is called leakage. As words unintentionally come out and give the person away. There are several ways you can phrase a statement based on all your knowledge. Therefore, the statement may contain information they did not intend to share. The key is to listen to what people are telling you and to know what to look for in a statement.

Pronouns, articles, objective time

Pronouns are universal and instinctive. They require no pre-thought and are 100% accurate for analysis. We will indicate more than one person, for example. Where we find that the pronouns are lying, it is conclusive that deception is indicated. This is such a powerfully intuitive ^{03.00} element of the English language that it is our only exception to not indicating one for deception on a single red flag. Pronouns simply do not lie.

Now we're going to look at articles in a statement. Articles include *a*, *an*, and *the*. They're simple to learn and once memorized move over time to instinctive. Though this may not be seen completely until age 7. For example,

A man approached me from behind. He had a gun. He told me he would shoot me and pushed the gun into my back. I gave the man my purse and ran.

You will note that he was <a man>, but once identified he became <the man> to whom she gave her purse. Unknown to her, the subject, he was <a man>, but once identified, he rightfully and instinctively became <the man>. She did not pause to consider which article to use. This is instinctive. This is likely a truthful statement. ^{04.00} In example 2,

The man approached me from behind. He had the gun. He said to me that he would shoot me and pushed a gun into my back. I gave a man my purse and left.

Did you note the location of the article the beginning the statement? If this is an open statement, it is deceptive, and the interview will likely prove that she knows the gunman and is seeking to conceal this information; <the man> is a male that she knows. Therefore, the use of the word <the> is appropriate for her. In a pre-planned scam, the participants know what weapons they have. Therefore, <the gun> makes sense. Yet why then did she get mixed up and say <a gun>? This may reflect knowledge of him having more than one <gun>. In some cases, it is an outright fabrication and the articles reveal as much. There was no <man> and because it comes from the imagination, deceptive subjects sometimes confuse the articles. Think Casey Anthony and Zanny the Nanny.

So the takeaway message is that pronouns ^{05.00} do not lie. Articles do not lie. People lie.

The third item that is exempt from someone's personal subjective dictionary is objective time on a clock. When one says, <It is 4 p.m.>, it will be four hours past noon for all of us. There is no subjectivity here. This one is simple and needs no examples for analysis. A word of caution though, if somebody adds words such as "around", or "it was like", or "roughly", or "four-ish" etc., that may indicate it was not 4 p.m. to the subject.

High sensitivity indicators

In statement analysis, there are two indicators of the highest sensitivity.

The first is the need to explain the reason why someone does something. When someone who should simply tell us what happened has a need to tell us why something happened, it is considered the highest level of sensitivity in a statement. It sounds as if the subject anticipates being asked why something was done, so she thinks to herself, “I better ^{06.00} tell them why I did this in case they ask me.”

The second is the word "left" when used as a connecting verb, which indicates missing information. This missing information is 70% likely due to rushing and 30% likely to be critical, missing, or deliberately withheld information.

So those are the two things that statement analysts highlight or mark with blue, which indicates the highest level of sensitivity. I'm going to give you an example of a sentence with some sensitivities.

I got off of work, **left** Universal, driving back **to** pick up Caylee like a normal day.

If you don't recognize who this could be from, it's from Casey Anthony. And you see <left> is highlighted in blue, which means it's sensitive because she's leaving somewhere. So the question is, why was leaving Universal so very sensitive to Casey Anthony? And the answer to that is because she did not have a job there.

Next, you'll see the word <to> highlighted in blue, and "to" is one of those words that indicates that the subject is giving us the reason why. Here we have the second indicator of the highest ^{07.00} sensitivity as she tells us the reason why she had to «drive back» – <to pick up Caylee>. It is noted that «picking up Caylee» is something that is extremely sensitive to Casey. The question is, why was driving back to pick up Caylee so very sensitive? The answer is because Caylee was dead and not in need of being picked up.

There are many different items that are sensitive when analyzing a statement. The two highest sensitivity items are the need to explain why, to justify or persuade, and the leaving or departing of a place. Those are the only two items that are noted in blue. Now, where we find more than one blue – cluster of blues together – this is often the place in the statement where crimes are solved.

Other principles and indicators

[Statement-] Analysis says that every word has meaning, and as a rule hard and fast, there is no such thing as a synonym in analysis. The difference comes from within the subject. Each person has their own internal subjective personal dictionary of about 25,000 words, and those of higher intelligence may even have as many as 35,000, but on ^{08.00} average 25,000 is a safe number. With this speed of transmission in an open statement, there are no synonyms used as there might be when someone is doing creative writing. When speaking, especially during the free editing process, the person is speaking without forethought that is live and not stopping to consider each word.

So what about creative writing? Weren't we taught not to keep using the same word for fear of dull repetition? Well, yes, talented writers will avoid tedious repetition for the sake of interest, but it is not how people talk and it is not what people are thinking on the fly when answering questions, especially when the context is a stressful situation.

My car sputtered and died. I left the vehicle on the side of the road.

What happened in reality that caused the <car>, which was <my car>, to turn into <the vehicle>, not even ~~<my>~~ <vehicle>? It was that the <car> was no longer useful. I can tell you that when he picks up the repaired <vehicle>, it will turn into a <car> again. Change in language indicates a change in reality. This change in reality should be supported within the statement itself, that is, ^{09.00}within the context. If the change in language is justified within the context of the statement, it is a very strong indication that memory, that is experiential memory, is in play.

The common term is <car> and not <vehicle>. "Vehicle" is something commonly used by law enforcement, insurance adjusters, and mechanics. It was a <car> prior to breaking down. While speaking of it, associating it with breaking down, it is a <vehicle>, which is distancing language. He did not want it to be his car when it no longer worked. This word change is made by the brain in less than a microsecond. We know that word choice is highly accurate and that word change is influenced first and foremost by emotion. Here, the emotion elicited when the car no longer ran caused his brain to change the <car> into a <vehicle>. Where there is no contextual change, the analyst should consider that the subject is not working from memory, as language does not change on its own, but that the subject has lost track of the fabrication since it is not embedded within memory.

Statement analysis principle: when there is no justification within the context for the change of ^{10.00}language, the analyst should consider that deception is present.

Statement analysis relies on the subject's own words to guide us to the truth. It is only their words that interest us. This is why it is important to remove all emotion and voice inflection from their words. The subject's emotions can alter the way we hear what they are saying. If the subject is deceptive, they are relying on the recipient of their message to interpret what they said. It is a typical dulled listening that we employ along with our natural tendency to interpret through our own emotional lens that the deceptive person is counting on. There are basic statement analysis principles that will be explained as we move through Melissa's statement.

Part of statement analysis is reflecting on what is typical behavior in speech given the subject situation. With that in mind, I want you to imagine that you have a teenage daughter and she has been missing for 10 hours. Law enforcement is involved and they have been searching the area. You live near a desert where there are wide temperature swings. ^{11.00}You have voiced concern about her ability to reason. She did not bring any possessions with her.

What would you do?

What would you say?

This is called the expected in statement analysis. Now before you raise your hand and say, “But wait, how can anyone who hasn’t experienced this know what they would do or say?” my answer is this. Have you ever briefly lost your child in a store? Did you finish your shopping, pay for your items, go home, and put your items away, and then return to the store to look for your child? Okay, I didn’t think so. So we can all agree that there are typical behaviors exhibited by parents of a missing child. Following Melissa’s statement analysis, we will outline what typical behavior looks and sounds like. We will then compare this to her statement to see if her statement is what is expected or unexpected.

Analysis

First, we’re going to start out with the first two sentences of her statement, which are,

My name is Melissa Gusé. Um, if you’re ^{12.00}going to watch this video, please do not have the kids around. Karlie Lain Gusé is missing still.

Sentence 1

So it’s important to note where a subject starts their statement because they can really start it anywhere they like. We have a huge dictionary of words in our head. The first sentence often indicates the purpose of the statement, and there is always a reason people mention the things or people in the order that they do. The order mentioned indicates importance to the subject. When I say “subject”, I mean the person speaking. And so number one on Melissa’s list of importance is herself. She says, <My name is Melissa Gusé>. Number two is Melissa’s audience as referenced, <if you’re going to watch this video>. Number three are <the kids>: <please do not have the kids around>. Number four, Karlie: <Karlie Lain Gusé is missing>. So Karlie is fourth on Melissa’s list of importance and this does indicate distance in their relationship.

^{13.01} Immediately following her first few words, Melissa pauses with <Um>. Every word is important to the analysis. Here <Um> is important as it is a pause to think – a pause in the speedy process of the brain. <Um> slows the flow of information to decrease the chance of inadvertently revealing information the subject wants to contain. <Um> may also indicate withheld information. And then she continues on, <if you’re going to watch this video>, not, ~~I need you~~ <to watch this video>. With the word <if>, Melissa introduces doubt into her statement. She’s telling her audience that viewing this <video> is optional. Her child is missing and she is making the information she is giving optional to the viewer.

She then says, <please do not have the kids around>, not ~~Do~~ <not have the kids around>; <please> is an additional, unnecessary word, which if you were to remove that word from the sentence, the sentence would still be complete. ^{14.00} And in statement analysis, extra words are important as they provide additional meaning. The shortest sentence is the best sentence, and we do not expect polite requests such as <please> when a child is missing. There is no linguistic urgency from Melissa.

In the next few words, she says <please do not have the kids around>, and the word <not> makes this a negative statement. And so when a subject makes a spontaneous nega-

tion, it indicates that the topic following the negation is sensitive. In this sentence, Melissa is sensitive to the <kids> <not> seeing or hearing what she has to say. And you'll note that she's not saying ~~<your>~~ <kids>, when she addressed her audience as <you>. Melissa says <the kids>, and it would make more sense that she would refer to the kids as ~~<your>~~ <kids>. Is she speaking to someone specifically about <the kids>? And as a side note, Melissa refers to her two sons as <the kids> in her Dr. Phil interview on March 25th, 2019.

If you can recall the discussion about articles with the *a* ^{15.00} and *an* and *the*, when she introduced <kids> to her statement, there should have been a different article in front of the <kids>. And so please consider that Melissa was speaking directly to whomever was watching her children. Presumably her younger children were home the morning Karlie went missing and already know about this situation. Melissa wanting to shield her children from information they already have is unusual. Even if she was able to keep this information from them before they went to someone else's home, they live with Karlie and will know regardless. This is unexpected.

Sentence 2

Her second sentence is,

Karlie Lain Gusé is missing still.

Here Melissa gives Karlie's full name with no formal introduction. We are left wondering, who is Melissa to Karlie? Melissa asked for her friends to share this message with others who do not know Melissa or Karlie. The expected would be ~~<my stepdaughter>~~ or ~~<I'm her stepmother>~~. Melissa shows no ownership in her relationship with Karlie. This indicates further ^{16.00} that this is a distant strained relationship between Melissa and Karlie. This is unexpected.

When she says the word <still> that is an added unnecessary word which makes it very important in statement analysis. And <still> speaks to time. This implies that her audience is already aware that Karlie is <missing>. Yet the purpose of Melissa's statement is to inform the public of Karlie's <missing> status.

Statement analysis principle: unnecessary wording is only unnecessary until we understand the subject.

It is unusual also to place the word <still> at the end of the sentence as an afterthought, and when <still> is used this way it's typically in poems or lyrics when the listener has expressed doubt in what the speaker is saying. Placing <still> at the end of this sentence shows the need to persuade that Karlie's <missing> status is true. Melissa has not mentioned anyone expressing doubt that Karlie is <missing> which causes one to wonder who is she concerned about not believing her.

Does she have the need to persuade someone else, ^{17.00} or herself?

This may also presuppose that she will be found not to be <missing>, as if she knows the final outcome will be something else. She wants to emphasize that she's <missing> and not something more sinister. This may be leakage that Karlie is indeed not <missing> to Melissa. We'll keep going and see where her language guides us.

Sentence 3

Her next two sentences are,

She's been missing since - breathe - she's been missing since 6:30 a.m. The last time that I spoke to her was 5:30.

The first thing we notice is her repetition of <she's been missing since>, and repetition indicates sensitivity to the statements as well as anxiety. She then instructs herself to <breathe> in between those two repetitions and this serves the same purpose as <Um> in her statement. She's slowing down her thinking to avoid inadvertent leakage.

Sentence 4

She mentions the time <6:30 a.m.>, ^{18.01} and we always take note of time given in a statement. She says, <last time that I spoke to her was 5:30>. Not <spoke> ~~<with>~~ <her>, not ~~<talked with>~~ <her>, not ~~<saw>~~ <her>. Melissa <spoke to> Karlie. This indicates this may have been a one-way conversation. Karlie is not quoted, and it makes more sense for her to have *seen* her, when she <last> <spoke to her>. Yet Melissa only mentions <spoke to>.

Wouldn't the last visual memory of a loved one be more precious and worthy of mention?

Melissa only mentioning <spoke to> suggests there was another time after «speaking» to Karlie that she saw Karlie, and she is deceptively withholding that information.

Melissa then mentions <5:30>, and we note that time. Melissa's timeline of <last> <spoke to> Karlie at <5:30> and the time she's reporting Karlie <missing>, which was <6:30 a.m.> is not expected. If Karlie went missing at <6:30 a.m.>, why did Melissa mention <last spoke to> Karlie at <5:30>? How ^{19.00} does she know Karlie went missing an hour after she <last> <spoke to her>? We'll let her language guide us.

Sentence 5

She didn't take her cellphone.

That which is reported in the negative is significant and sensitive to the subject. Melissa is reporting what Karlie <didn't> take.

What else <didn't> Carly take?

The list could be long. She chose to mention <cellphone>, because her brain was thinking about Karlie's <cellphone> relative to the time she went missing. Karlie's <cellphone> is sensitive to Melissa. Viewing this sentence as such, it is categorized as a hina clause. This sentence is directly tied to the previous sentence and anticipates the question, "Why haven't you spoke to her since 5:30?" The subject, Melissa, anticipates being asked, "Why didn't you speak to Karlie after 5:30?", and wants to answer the question before it is asked – part of an overall need to explain or need to persuade that is very sensitive. This need to beat them to the punch, so to speak, suggests to the analyst the need to explore if the subject had a very different reason ^{20.00} for not speaking to Karlie after <5:30>.

Cellphones are used for both communication and location. Without her cell phone, Karlie is unable to be reached or located. We also note that given Karlie's age, it is unexpected for her to leave her <cellphone> behind.

It is also worth noting that in a statement when a person uses the unique word "phone", that often ties the person to the crime scene. If you're a witness to a crime, you might call 911 on your cellphone. In your statement to the police, you would probably mention this. The word "cellphone" ties you to the crime scene, but in an innocent way. For others, though, the use of this word ties them to the crime scene in a not-so-innocent way.

Melissa Gusé's Facebook Live video from October 13, 2018 was a mere 3 minutes and 30 seconds, yet it yielded an amazing amount of fascinating content for analysis. Statement Analysis takes time to formulate and to communicate. In an effort to keep this presentation ^{21.00}manageable for viewers, I have created separate videos. It is best to start with Part 1, as the first 10 minutes give some basic principles of Statement Analysis, and move forward from there. My hope is to get to the truth of what happened to Karlie on that morning in October.